Namibia - Conservancy Support

Report generated on: April 26, 2018

Visit our data catalog at: https://data.mcc.gov/evaluations/index.php

Overview

Identification

COUNTRY
Namibia

EVALUATION TITLE
Conservancy Support

EVALUATION TYPE
Independent Performance Evaluation

ID NUMBER
DDI-MCC-NAM-IE-AG2-CS-2014-v01

Version

VERSION DESCRIPTION
- v01: Edited, anonymous dataset for public distribution.

Overview

ABSTRACT
The evaluation employs a mixed-methods approach in which qualitative techniques and quantitative analysis support each other, recognizing that the techniques used will depend on the evaluation question to be addressed.

The source of information for the qualitative analysis is through Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with the household and conservancy or PPO member-households and management, as well as with stakeholders in the tourism sector from the private-sector and associated regulatory bodies.

In the case of the quantitative analysis, control groups are not available for the evaluation of either the CS activity or INP sub-activities. The CS activity is taking place in most of the conservancies of the Northern Communal Areas (NCAs), which were selected for their tourism potential. Conservancies outside of this activity are generally in areas with differing natural endowments and market access and, as such, cannot serve as a comparable set of non-intervention conservancies. In the case of the INP sub-activities, it is not feasible to establish a valid comparison group because the intervention covers nearly the entire INP producer population. Instead, a type of a reflexive (before-and-after) design called a dose-response model is employed whereby each conservancy or PPO at baseline contributes to our understanding of the counterfactual by allowing us to infer whether differences in the amount of Compact assistance (the "dosage") influence and, therefore, impact on CS or INP performance.

The model identifies likely program impacts by estimating the marginal effects of different intervention levels (e.g., intensity of training or number and type of grants) on outputs and outcomes of interest at critical points along the causal chain from the short to medium run. Originally, program impact on household income, the ultimate expected result by MCA-N, was to be a focus of examination, but it is now accepted that such changes would not likely be large enough to be detected over the relatively short evaluation period.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY
Pre-Post

UNITS OF ANALYSIS
Depending on the research question: conservancy, PPO, household, individual

Household survey: The primary unit of analysis is the household. The definition of a household for the purposes of this survey is a group of people that live in the same compound and take meals together at least 4 days a week, as well as young children living elsewhere that are answerable to the head of the household. Several questions in the questionnaire apply to each individual family member.

TOPICS

Topic	Vocabulary	URI
Gender	MCC Sector	
Other	MCC Sector	

KEYWORDS
Performance evaluation, Namibia, Agriculture, Tourism, Harvest

Coverage

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE
Evaluation: Northern Communal Areas of Namibia

Household Survey: The survey covers twenty-three INP producer organizations and twenty-eight conservancies in nine regions of Namibia. It covers the conservancies and INP producer organizations of interest and is not meant to be nationally representative.

UNIVERSE
For Conservancies, there are a total of 76 conservancies in Namibia, 28 of which are included in the evaluation.

Producers and Sponsors

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S)

Name	Affiliation
NORC at the University of Chicago	

FUNDING

Name	Abbreviation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC	

Metadata Production

METADATA PRODUCED BY

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC		Review of Metadata

DDI DOCUMENT ID
DDI-MCC-NAM-IE-AG2-CS-2014-v01

MCC Compact and Program

COMPACT OR THRESHOLD
Namibia Compact

PROGRAM
The Millennium Challenge Corporation's (MCC) Compact with the Republic of Namibia aims to reduce poverty through economic growth fostered by investment in the Education, Tourism and Agriculture sectors. The Millennium Challenge Account Namibia (MCA-N) was established to design and implement activities in these three areas to achieve this anti-poverty objective. The Conservancy Support and Indigenous Natural Products Household Survey (CS/INP) is a comprehensive two-round household survey of approximately 1,500 households in 2011 and 2014. The data were collected in order to evaluate the impact of the Millennium Challenge Account Namibia's implementation of two separate anti-poverty measures in Namibia: first, investments in communal conservancies in the northern part of the country designed to attract ecotourism and generate revenue for local inhabitants; and second, assistance to producer and processor organizations (PPOs) of indigenous natural products, meant to improve product quality and production of harvesters and enhance business capacity of PPOs. In order to evaluate these interventions, the survey collected extensive data on household income,

finances, expenses, and assets, as well as data on specific elements of the intervention (training, payments, etc.). While the primary objective of the survey was to generate indicator variables regarding the financial situation of households, valuable data on household characteristics and demographics were also collected. As part of the Tourism component of the Compact, the Conservancy Support (CS) Activity aims to strengthen capacity of conservancies to protect and manage their natural resources, attract investment, and achieve financial sustainability so that households in communal conservancy areas can receive a greater share of increased revenues. Based on individual conservancy needs and demands, the CS Activity is providing a range of technical assistance services and grant funding to 31 conservancies considered likely destinations for tourism. The 31 selected conservancies include the majority of Namibia's most progressive and financially viable communal conservancies. Of these, 29 are existing conservancies and two are newly established. On the advice of MCA-N and the implementation contractor, only the 29 well established conservancies are included in the evaluation.

MCC SECTOR
Agriculture and Irrigation (Ag & Irr)

PROGRAM LOGIC
CS Program Logic. The CS interventions are focused entirely at the institutional level of the conservancy. The logic is predicated upon the hypothesis that the stronger the institutional capacity of conservancy management structures the more likely conservancies will grow and the resulting increased revenue/benefits will filter down to the household level. Hence, CS program logic does not assume a direct causal relationship between funding, assistance, and training, on the one hand, and household standard-of-living indicators, on the other. Rather, the logic of the intervention suggests increased conservancy capacity will lead to conservancy-level outcomes (joint venture lodge development, small and medium enterprise growth, tourism growth) and these outcomes will, in turn, impact household indicators.

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS
CS Activity. The CS Activity focused building management capacity at 31 conservancies.

Sampling

Study Population

For Conservancies, there are a total of 76 conservancies in Namibia, 28 of which are included in the evaluation.

Sampling Procedure

For the CS Activity, the baseline sample design was a two-stage sample design in which the first-stage primary sample units (PSUs) were Enumeration Areas (EAs) that overlapped with conservancies and the second-stage sample units were households. A number of variables were known (from Census and GIS sources) for each EA (or the constituency in which an EA was located) that could be used to assist sample design. To select households within each PSU, two random starting points were selected, and six households were selected for each random starting point (from each starting point, every fifth household was selected). This methodology was carried out because NORC did not have lists of households for each conservancy. NORC therefore did not have a sample of households before starting fieldwork; instead Field Interviewers (FIs) selected households based on a step-wise method using a systematic walk pattern from the random starting point. When a household was absent, interviewers went to the next available household.

The endline sample for the CS Activity consisted of a 100% panel sample with replacement. In other words, FIs re-contacted all baseline respondents. If a baseline respondent could not be interviewed (refusal or unlocatable), FIs replaced the respondent with the next available household to the right of the respondent's home.

Response Rate

CS Survey. At baseline, 1032 interviews were completed from an initial target of 1188 interviews (although NORC was contractually required to complete 1000 interviews). When a household was absent, interviewers went to the next available household but did not document the households that they attempted to interview and which were unsuccessful. This oversight made it difficult to calculate an accurate response rate based on the total number of attempted interviews. However, there were 99 EAs in the sample and a target number of 12 interviews in each EA. The total target sample size was thus 1188 (12 x 99). We can use this target sample as a proxy for calculating the response rate. With these assumptions, the response rate would be: 1032/1188 = 86.9%.

For the endline CS survey, 1024 interviews (out of a target of 1032) were completed. Of these, 241 are replacement households; therefore, field teams managed to re-interview 76.5% of respondents.

Weighting

Conservancy Household Sampling Weights for Baseline and Endline:

For the sampling plan, NORC generated 90 site-specific sampling weights for about 1,000 households - that is, on average about twelve households receive the same weight. A complex process was used and involved a technique called variable stratification. The CS survey was a two-stage sample in which the first-stage sample units (primary sample units, or PSUs) were portions of Census Enumeration Areas (EAs) that overlap with conservancies, and the second-stage sample units (elements, ultimate sample units) were households. The first-stage sample units (EA portions) were selected with variable probabilities, to assure adequate variation in explanatory variables related to outcomes of interest. The second-stage sample was a random sample of households selected from each first-stage sample unit. The intended household sample size within each PSU was 12, but this varied a little, because of inability to obtain this number of sample households in a PSU, or to obtain replacement households for PSUs falling short of this target number.
An "unnormalized" sample weight is obtained for each PSU by dividing the total number of households in each sample PSU by the product of the PSU selection probability times the number of sample households in the PSU. The term "unnormalized" is used because of sampling variability. A "normalized" per-household weight is obtained by normalizing the resulting values such that the total weight for all sample households equals the total number of households in the population.
Since the endline replacement households were "near" to the original household, the sampling weight from any lost household was also applied to the household that replaced it.

Questionnaires

Overview

2013-2014 Qualitative Data Collection:
The conservancy guide covers the following topics, as relevant:
- Business partnerships and conservancy revenue
- Conservancy governance
- Effect of game acquisitions
- Household well-being
- Gender dimensions of access and benefits
- Sustainability

The PPO guide covers the following topics:
- PPO organisational capacity
- Harvest, sales and income
- Household wellbeing
- Intra-household gender considerations
- Sustainability

2011-2014 Quantitative Data Collection:
- Household surveys. Two rounds of the CS survey and the INP survey, which are explicitly designed for the evaluation, and will track the same group of 300 INP harvester-households and 1,000 CS members in 2011 (baseline), and 2014 (endline). To compensate for INP harvesters not accessible during baseline an additional 200 will be interviewed at endline to bring the endline total to 500. These data will provide information on important measures of impact, as well as on household characteristics and demographics.

- Organisational surveys. Both to track governance and management improvements at the level of the conservancy and PPO, as well as to collect fixed-effect covariates for household-level multivariate analysis, "factsheets" will be completed for each conservancy and PPO. In the case of the former, NORC will draw on the implementer databases (see next bullet) as well as the 2009 ARD baseline conservancy needs assessment (CNA) of conservancy institutional capacity. In the case of the PPOs, the expectation is that the factsheets could be completed using NRI's database of monitoring data; any remaining unanswered questions would be answered during the fielding of the household survey.

- Implementer databases. For the CS activity these would include the NACSO Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) database, which has annual information on key economic indicators of interest such as revenues at conservancy level and share of conservancy revenue paid out in dividends, as well as conservancy-level GIS data and game counts available through internal databases for the Conservancy Development Support Services (CDSS), and the Conservancy Development Grants Fund (CDSGF). Separately, there are data on the size of grants and the geographic distribution of services and grants. For the INP activity these would include Natural Resources Institute (NRI), University of Greenwich's program monitoring outputs.

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle

Questionnaires

2013-2014 Qualitative Data Collection:
The conservancy guide covers the following topics, as relevant:
- Business partnerships and conservancy revenue
- Conservancy governance
- Effect of game acquisitions
- Household well-being
- Gender dimensions of access and benefits
- Sustainability

The PPO guide covers the following topics:
- PPO organisational capacity
- Harvest, sales and income
- Household wellbeing
- Intra-household gender considerations
- Sustainability

2011-2014 Quantitative Data Collection:
- Household surveys. Two rounds of the CS survey and the INP survey, which are explicitly designed for the evaluation, and will track the same group of 300 INP harvester-households and 1,000 CS members in 2011 (baseline), and 2014 (endline). To compensate for INP harvesters not accessible during baseline an additional 200 will be interviewed at endline to bring the endline total to 500. These data will provide information on important measures of impact, as well as on household characteristics and demographics.

- Organisational surveys. Both to track governance and management improvements at the level of the conservancy and PPO, as well as to collect fixed-effect covariates for household-level multivariate analysis, "factsheets" will be completed for each conservancy and PPO. In the case of the former, NORC will draw on the implementer databases (see next bullet) as well as the 2009 ARD baseline conservancy needs assessment (CNA) of conservancy institutional capacity. In the case of the PPOs, the expectation is that the factsheets could be completed using NRI's database of monitoring data; any remaining unanswered questions would be answered during the fielding of the household survey.

- Implementer databases. For the CS activity these would include the NACSO Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) database, which has annual information on key economic indicators of interest such as revenues at conservancy level and share of conservancy revenue paid out in dividends, as well as conservancy-level GIS data and game counts available through internal databases for the Conservancy Development Support Services (CDSS), and the Conservancy Development Grants Fund (CDSGF). Separately, there are data on the size of grants and the geographic distribution of services and grants. For the INP activity these would include Natural Resources Institute (NRI), University of Greenwich's program monitoring outputs.

Data Collectors

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation
Survey Warehouse		

Data Processing

Data Editing

NORC performed a number of logic and consistency checks on the data.

Other Processing

Data entry was conducted using an Epidata platform that matched the survey content and allowed for careful checks of internal logic and consistency. Data for the CS/INP survey was double data entered by data enterers in an iterative process that began the second week of data collection for both rounds. After completing data entry the two Epidata files were compared and reconciled by going through the hardcopy questionnaires where appropriate.

Data Appraisal

No content available